UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,583	12/22/1999	PHILIP C. LEVERIDGE	36-1302	2585

23117 7590 08/17/2004

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER	
BAUGH, APRIL L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2141	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/446,583	LEVERIDGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April L Baugh	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-8,23 and 24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-8,23 and 24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant has amended claims 2-8 and canceled claims 1, 9-14, and 16-22, and added new claims 23-24. Therefore claims 2-8 and 23-24 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-8 and 23-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3-4, 7, and 23-24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 6,061,741 to Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. (US Patent No. 5,560,008).

Regarding claim 23, Murphy, Jr. et al. teaches a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating a user of a client application provided on a client terminal having no unique IP address via a data communications network, the server system being arranged to control access to a document stored on a resource server connected to said data communications network (Fig. 1a), said method comprising performing the following steps in said server system: receiving at the resource server a request for said document generated by said client application; evaluating at the resource server client-side persistent information accompanying said request including checking if the client-side persistent information contains an address token previously issued by the resource server which uniquely identifies the user (column 3, lines 22-25 and column 4, lines 4-7 and column 7, lines 60-67), and performing the following steps at the resource server: if no address token which uniquely identifies the user is contained in the client-side persistent information accompanying said request: generating an address token which uniquely identifies the user; transmitting the generated address token to the client application in a client- side persistent information packet so that an address token which uniquely identifies the user is generated and transmitted without prior receipt at the resource server of a previously issued address token which uniquely identifies the user; and storing said address token for the user (column 1, lines 57-62 and column 5, lines 41-49 and column 8, lines 4-9); or ii) if an address token which uniquely identifies the user is contained in the client-side persistent information accompanying said request and the address token is an unvalidated address token: validating the address token using other authentication data received from the client terminal in said client-side persistent information and by reference to user authentication data already stored on said resource server; storing the validated address token for an

authenticated user and an access status of the authenticated user associated with the validated address token (column 2, lines 60-65 and column 5; lines 49-52); or iii) if an address token which uniquely identifies the user is contained in the client-side persistent information accompanying said request and the address token is a validated address token, using said validated address token to enable said resource server to validate said request for said document (column 1, lines 63-65 and column 5, lines 52).

Murphy, Jr. et al. does not teach by checking if said stored access status for said user includes access to said document. Johnson et al. teaches iii) if an address token which uniquely identifies the user is contained in the client-side persistent information accompanying said request and the address token is a validated address token, using said validated address token to enable said resource server to validate said request for said document by checking if said stored access status for said user includes access to said document (column 4, lines 35-40, column 10, line 62 through column 11, line 7, and column 12, lines 12-16). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communications system of Murphy, Jr. et al. by checking if said stored access status for said user includes access to said document because this step further creates another level of protection for accessing private documents.

Referring to claim 3, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method according to claim 23, wherein said authentication step comprises receiving said address token from said client terminal with said authentication data (column 2, lines 60-65 and column 5; lines 49-52 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

Regarding claim 4, Murphy, Jr. et al teaches a method according to claim 3 (column 2, lines 60-65 and column 5; lines 49-52).

Murphy, Jr. et al. does not teach wherein a new address token is issued to said client terminal if said authentication data is invalid. Johnson et al. teaches wherein a new address token is issued to said client terminal if said authentication data is invalid (column 13, lines 32-36). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communications system of Murphy, Jr. et al. by wherein a new address token is issued to said client terminal if said authentication data is invalid because this creates a periodic re-validation of users and therefore inhibits others from masquerading as a particular user.

Regarding claim 7, Murphy, Jr. et al. teaches a method according to claim 23 (column 5, lines 41-52).

Murphy, Jr. et al. does not teach of timing out said address token. Johnson et al. teaches of timing out of said address token of a terminal of a currently authenticated user if no document request is received from said client terminal for a predetermined period (column 6, lines 21-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Murphy, Jr. et al. by timing out said address token because if a user were to forget to logout of a session another could use that workstation to access information that they are not authorized to view and the timing out of the address token lessens the chance of this happening therefore increasing the security of the system.

Regarding claim 24, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method as claimed in claim 23, wherein step (ii) further comprises: transmitting said requested document to said client terminal along with a client-side persistent information packet containing the validated address token to the client terminal (column 2, lines 60-65 and column 5; lines 49-52 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

3. Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 6,061,741 to Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. as applied to claims 3-4, 7, and 23-24 above, and further in view of Kirsch (US Patent No. 5,963,915).

Regarding claim 2, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method according to claim 23, wherein said address token is transmitted to said client terminal (column 1, lines 57-62 and column 5, lines 41-49 and column 8, lines 4-9 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. does not teach the transmission of the address token in a cookie. Kirsch teaches that said address token is transmitted in a cookie to said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 14-16 and column 13, lines 11-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communication system of Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. by transmitting the address token in a cookie because it is a more secure manner of storage and transport of identification data.

4. Claim 5-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,061,741 to Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. as applied to claims 3-4, 7, and 23-24 above, and further in view of See et al. (US Patent No. 6,070,243).

Regarding claim 5, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method according to claim 4 and an address token (column 2, line 42 and column 4, lines 4-7 of Murphy, Jr. et al.), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said client terminal (column 5, lines 20-23 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. does not teach that the address token contains the number of times an invalid authenticator was received. See et al. teaches said address token comprises data indicating the number of times an invalid authenticator has been received from said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 23-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communication system of Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. by having the address token contain the number of times an invalid authenticator was received because a user can be denied access if they submit multiple invalid authenticators thus providing the system with added security and access control.

Referring to claim 6, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method according to claim 5, and an address token (column 2, line 42 and column 4, lines 4-7 of Murphy, Jr. et al.), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said client terminal (column 5, lines 20-23 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. does not teach that the system will not issue address tokens to the user if an address token received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from the user. See et al. teaches said method comprising issuing no further address token to said client terminal if an address token received from said user's client terminal indicates that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators

have been received from said user's client terminal (column 6, lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communication system of Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. by not issuing address tokens to the user if an address token received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from the user because this provides the system with added security and access control by not allowing unauthorized users access to server information.

5. Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 6,061,741 to Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. as applied to claims 3-4, 7, and 23-24 above, and further in view of Levergood et al. (US Patent No. 5,708,780).

Referring to claim 8, Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. teaches a method according to claim 23 (column 5; lines 49-52 of Murphy, Jr. et al.).

Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. does not teach authenticating said user for access to a plurality of Web servers located in the same Internet domain. Levergood et al. teaches comprising authenticating said user for access to a plurality of Web servers located in the same Internet domain (column 3, lines 66-67); and enabling each of said Web servers to validate document requests from the client terminal, which requests include said address token (column 3, lines 44-45), by checking said status data on receipt of a document request (column 6, lines 58-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the data communication system of Murphy, Jr. et al. in view of Johnson et al. by authenticating said user for access to a plurality of Web servers located

in the same Internet domain because this creates a more efficient system by decreasing the processing time to re-authenticate a user on multiple servers within the same domain.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul H. Kang can be reached on 703-308-6123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April L. Baugh
Assistant Examiner
ALB

Paul H. Kang
Primary Examiner